



Development of a Knowledge-Based Energy Damage Model for Evaluating Industrialised Building
Systems (IBS) Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) Risk

Nor Haslinda Abas

School of Property Construction and Project Management

College of Design and Social Context

RMIT University

February 2015



PTTHA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUN AMINAH

Declaration

I certify that except where due acknowledgement has been made, the work is that of the author alone; the work has not been submitted previously, in whole or in part, to qualify for any other academic award; the content of the thesis/project is the result of work which has been carried out since the official commencement date of the approved research program; any editorial work, paid or unpaid, carried out by a third party is acknowledged; and, ethics procedures and guidelines have been followed.

Nor Haslinda Abas

13 February 2015



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

ABSTRACT

Malaysia's construction industry has been long considered hazardous, owing to its poor health and safety record. It is proposed that one of the ways to improve safety and health in the construction industry is through the implementation of 'off-site' systems, commonly termed 'industrialised building systems (IBS)' in Malaysia, which require fewer workers on-site. This is deemed safer, based on the risk concept of reduced exposure; however, no method yet exists for determining the relative safety of various construction methods, including IBS.

This thesis presents a comparative evaluation of the occupational health and safety (OHS) risk presented by different construction approaches, namely IBS and traditional methods. The evaluation involved developing a model based on the concept of 'argumentation theory', which helps construction designers integrate the management of OHS risk into the design process. In addition, an 'energy damage model' was used as an underpinning framework.

Development of the model was achieved through three phases. Phase I involved collection of data on the activities involved in the construction process and their associated OHS risks, derived from five different case studies, field observation and interviews. Knowledge on design aspects that have the potential to impact on OHS was obtained from document analysis. Using the knowledge obtained in Phase I, a model was developed in the form of argument trees (Phase II), which represent a reasoning template with regard to options available to designers when they make judgements about aspects of their designs. Inferences from these aspects eventually determined the magnitude of the damaging energies for every activity involved. Finally, the model was validated by panels of experts (Phase III), and revisions and amendments were made to the model accordingly.

The model provides a means of evaluating OHS risk among construction workers, which could help designers understand the extent to which their design decisions may impact on OHS and thereby assist them to reduce the risk to an acceptable level. The development of the risk assessment model represents structured knowledge that designers can draw on when making judgments about OHS risks, in the form of argument trees. The model was categorized into several damaging energies, which provides a way to evaluate the risk from start to finish.

The research revealed that different approaches/methods of construction projects carried a different level of energy damage, depending on how the activities were carried out. A study of the way in which the risks change from one construction process to another shows that there is a difference in the profile of OHS risk between IBS construction and traditional methods. For example, the potential gravitational damaging energy for certain activities in the in-situ concrete and masonry method can be removed or reduced by the use of IBS/off-site methods such as the wall panel system and the panellised system. This is compatible

with other researchers' claims that IBS/off-site is safer and carries significantly less risk in traditional construction.

This thesis contributes to knowledge by suggesting options available to product and process designers that allow them to assess the extent to which their design decisions reduce OHS risk in construction, and offering a more rigorous comparison of the OHS risks in IBS and traditional approaches. It is anticipated that the model may provide a way for designers to integrate process knowledge and awareness of safety and OHS risk variables into design to eliminate or reduce hazards in construction.

Keywords: IBS, OHS in construction, knowledge-based energy damage model, off-site construction



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Foremost, I would like to express the deepest appreciation to my senior supervisors, Associate Professor Dr Nick Blismas for the continuous support of my PhD study and research, for his patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. His guidance helped me in all the time of the research and writing of this thesis. I would also like to express my sincere gratitude to my second supervisor, Professor Helen Lingard for her most welcome advice, guidance, suggestions and support throughout the course of the study. The constructive criticism and understanding provided encouragement throughout the research period. Without the guidance and persistent help from my supervisors, this dissertation would not have been possible.

My sincere thanks also go to the participating organizations who contributed to providing the case studies at their organizations, and also participating personnel who helped me through the data collection stage and supplying some materials to support the case study. They include: Kitacon Sdn Bhd, Global Prefab Sdn Bhd, Teraju Precast Sdn Bhd, Proven Holdings and Monarch building Systems Pty Ltd. Thank you also to individuals who participated in the survey carried out for model validation purposes.

Thanks also go to my fellow graduate students at the PCPM and staff of the PCPM. Special thanks go to my numerous friends who helped me throughout this academic exploration and for all the fun we have had in the last four years.

I would like to thank my husband for always supporting me and always be there for me through thick and thin. To my little daughter Maya, I'm sorry for being away from you for couple of months, in several times – all our sacrifices worth it now. I would like to thank my family: my parents and siblings for their unconditional love and support during the last four years. These special thanks also go to my in-laws and the whole family.

In addition, a thank you to my sponsor - Ministry of Higher Education Malaysia (MOHE), my working institution - Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM), best friends, friends and relatives. Thank you also to Rob Sheehan and the team from Sharp Words Editing and Writing Services for their professional editing service. I wish I could put more names here, but to those who are not mentioned here, you know I am thankful.

Once again, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Table of contents.....	iv
List of figures.....	xi
List of tables.....	xv
List of abbreviations.....	xviii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Research context.....	1
1.2.1 Malaysia’s construction industry accident rates	1
1.2.2 The relative safety of IBS.....	2
1.2.3 The concept of ‘designing for safety’ and IBS	3
1.3 Research purposes	4
1.3.1 Research questions and objectives.....	5
1.3.2 Scope and limitations of the study.....	5
1.4 Overview of research process	6
1.5 Significance of the study	7
1.6 Organization of the thesis	8
1.7 Summary	10
1.8 Ethics	11
2 HEALTH AND SAFETY PERFORMANCE AND ACCIDENT CAUSALITY.....	12
2.1 Introduction.....	12
2.2 Occupational health and safety (OHS) in construction and the importance of OHS study.....	12
2.2.1 Disproportionate injury and illness rates.....	12
2.2.2 High cost of construction accidents.....	15
2.2.3 Legal requirements.....	17
2.2.4 Types of accidents.....	20

2.3	Accident causation	26
2.3.1	Definitions of safety and accident	26
2.3.2	Accident causation models	27
2.3.3	Two-factor model	28
2.3.4	Reason's Accident Trajectory Theory	29
2.3.5	Generic health and safety causation model - ConCA model.....	32
2.3.6	Energy release theory (Haddon, 1973).....	34
2.3.7	Energy damage model (Viner, 1991).....	33
2.3.8	Accident causes.....	38
2.4	Summary.....	40
3	INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE OHS PERFORMANCE	41
3.1	Introduction.....	41
3.2	Safety performance measurement.....	41
3.3	Safety management technique and control system.....	44
3.3.1	Safety culture.....	45
3.4	Construction as a manufacturing process.....	47
3.5	Risk management in occupational health and safety.....	49
3.5.1	Risk management steps in OHS	51
3.6	Designing for safety.....	54
3.6.1	Designing for construction safety	54
3.6.2	Designer's role to influence safety through design	55
3.6.3	Existing designing for construction safety tools/research	56
3.7	Background of ToolSHeD and argument trees	59
3.7.1	Knowledge-based systems and their limitations	59
3.7.2	Argument trees	60
3.8	Argumentation theory	61
3.8.1	Argumentation and Toulmin's argument structure (TAS)	61
3.8.2	Variations of TAS application	63
3.8.3	The application of GAAM.....	64
3.9	Summary.....	68

4	INDUSTRIALISED BUILDING SYSTEMS (IBS) IN MALAYSIA.....	69
4.1	Introduction.....	69
4.2	Overview of Malaysian construction industry.....	69
4.3	Definition of IBS and other related terms.....	73
4.4	IBS Classification and Categorisation.....	76
4.4.1	Precast concrete framed buildings.....	78
4.4.2	Formwork systems.....	78
4.4.3	Steel framing system.....	79
4.4.4	Prefabricated timber framing system.....	79
4.4.5	Blockwork system.....	79
4.4.6	Innovative.....	80
4.5	IBS Development in Malaysia.....	81
4.5.1	Chronology of IBS Development in Malaysia.....	81
4.5.2	Status of IBS contactors and manufacturers.....	82
4.5.3	IBS and the Degree of Industrialisation.....	83
4.6	The phases of IBS construction.....	86
4.7	Benefits of IBS.....	88
4.8	IBS Impact upon Safety and Health.....	91
4.8.1	Safety, health and IBS.....	91
4.8.2	Recent research relating IBS to safety and health.....	93
4.8.3	Accident Causation model for IBS.....	95
4.9	Concluding remark of the literature review– theoretical background for thesis development.....	98
4.10	Summary	99
5	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	100
5.1	Introduction.....	100
5.2	Research approaches.....	101
5.3	Research design.....	102
5.3.1	Case study research overview.....	107
5.3.2	Model validation.....	113
5.4	Phase I - Knowledge acquisition.....	116

5.4.1	Research context and details of case studies.....	116
5.4.2	Field observation.....	118
5.4.3	Interviews.....	119
5.4.4	Document analysis.....	121
5.5	Phase II - Development of argument trees.....	123
5.5.1	Knowledge processing.....	123
5.5.2	Argumentation (Argument trees mapping)	126
5.6	Validation of the model (Phase III)	129
5.6.1	Expert panel validation survey.....	131
5.6.2	Validate and revise tool.....	135
5.7	Application of the model.....	136
5.8	Summary.....	139
6	CONSTRUCTION PROCESS SAFETY RISKS: CASE STUDIES.....	140
6.1	Introduction.....	140
6.2	Phase I – Data gathering.....	140
6.3	Case study 1.....	141
6.3.1	Background of the project.....	141
6.3.2	Reasons for choice of construction method.....	143
6.3.3	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘delivery’ works.....	145
6.3.4	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘manufacturing’ works.....	146
6.4	Case study 2.....	148
6.4.1	Background of the project.....	148
6.4.2	Reasons for choice of construction method.....	150
6.4.3	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘manufacturing’ works.....	153
6.4.4	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘delivery’ works.....	155
6.4.5	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘component installation’ works.....	156
6.4.6	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘insitu works’ stage.....	157
6.5	Case study 3.....	158
6.5.1	Background of the project.....	158
6.5.2	Reasons for choice of construction method.....	160

6.5.3	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘manufacturing’ works.....	162
6.5.4	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘delivery’ works.....	162
6.5.5	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘component installation’ works.....	162
6.5.6	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘in situ’ works.....	164
6.6	Case study 4.....	165
6.6.1	Background of the project.....	165
6.6.2	Reasons for choice of construction method.....	167
6.6.3	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘manufacturing’ works.....	170
6.6.4	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘delivery’ works.....	171
6.6.5	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘component installation’ works.....	172
6.6.6	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘in-situ’ works.....	173
6.7	Case study 5.....	174
6.7.1	Background of the project.....	174
6.7.2	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘manufacturing’ works.....	178
6.7.3	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘delivery’ works.....	179
6.7.4	Process and associated risks involved in the ‘component installation’ Works.....	180
6.8	Discussion.....	181
6.9	Summary.....	184
7	KNOWLEDGE-BASED ENERGY DAMAGE MODEL (ARGUMENT TREES).....	185
7.1	Introduction	185
7.2	Phase II.....	186
7.2.1	Formulating design aspects for reasoning purposes in the argument trees....	187
7.2.2	Translation into argument trees.....	189
7.3	Matters related to the development of the argument tree process.....	197
7.3.1	The process of translating the knowledge into argument trees – summary ...	197
7.3.2	Argument trees (tool) output and features.....	198
7.3.3	Argument trees assessment.....	201
7.3.4	Significance of the tool.....	202

7.4	Discussion.....	206
7.5	Summary.....	207
8	VALIDATION OF THE MODEL	208
8.1	Introduction.....	208
8.2	Phase III.....	208
8.3	Validation survey.....	209
8.3.1	Validation survey procedure.....	214
8.4	Results of the validation survey: Revising the tool.....	218
8.4.1	Content validity- proximity with tool and expert scores	218
8.4.2	Inter-rater Reliability- IRA scores.....	226
8.4.3	Amendments on the tree.....	229
8.5	Discussion.....	238
8.6	Summary.....	241
9	APPLICATION OF THE TOOL (MODEL).....	242
9.1	Introduction.....	242
9.2	Comparative analysis of case attributes.....	243
9.2.1	Risk profiles throughout the construction process – an overview.....	244
9.2.2	Risk profile of gravitational damaging energy.....	245
9.2.3	Risk profile of kinetic damaging energy.....	250
9.2.4	Risk profile of chemical energy.....	253
9.2.5	Risk profile of vibration energy.....	255
9.2.6	Risk profile of electrical energy.....	257
9.2.7	Risk profile of noise energy.....	259
9.3	Other aspects of the application of the tool.....	261
9.3.1	Form of sensitivity analysis of the argument tree.....	261
9.3.2	‘Exposure’ measure.....	263
9.4	Discussion.....	264
9.4.1	Sophisticated risk assessment tool (3D risk assessment).....	264
9.4.2	Process-focused.....	265
9.4.3	Time-variable risk assessment model.....	267

9.4.4 Multiple-risk view.....	268
9.5 Summary.....	269
10 CONCLUSION	270
10.1 Introduction.....	270
10.2 Achievement of the objectives.....	270
10.2.1 Objective 1.....	271
10.2.2 Objective 2.....	272
10.2.3 Objective 3.....	273
10.2.4 Objective 4.....	274
10.3 Contribution to knowledge.....	274
10.3.1 The development of a risk management tool.....	274
10.3.2 An understanding of the IBS construction risks.....	276
10.3.3 An understanding of the impact of IBS upon construction – implication of the research	276
10.3.4 Implications for industry.....	278
10.3.5 Significance of methodology.....	279
10.4 Limitations of the study.....	280
10.5 Publications from the study.....	282
10.6 Recommendations for future research.....	282
References.....	284
Appendix A.....	305
Appendix B.....	324
Appendix C.....	326
Appendix D.....	336
Appendix E.....	338
Appendix F.....	344

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Flow diagram of the research process.....	7
Figure 1.2	Structure of the thesis.....	10
Figure 2.1	Accident statistics (based on types of accidents) in construction industry reported to DOSH for the year 2002-2009 – Fatality.....	23
Figure 2.2	Accident statistics (based on types of accidents) in construction industry reported to DOSH for the year 2002-2009 - Non-fatality.....	24
Figure 2.3	The Two-factor model - adapted from Reason (1990).....	28
Figure 2.4	Reason’s accident trajectory model- adapted from Reason (1990) to reflect construction.....	31
Figure 2.5	ConCA model (Haslam et al., 2003).....	33
Figure 2.6	Energy Damage Model (Source: Guide to Best Practice for Safer Construction (RMIT, 2009); Adapted from Viner, 1998)).....	35
Figure 2.7	Opportunities for injury or damage intervention (Source: : Pryor et al., 2009).....	36
Figure 3.1	The transitions of safety performance indicators (Source: Jafri et al., 2005).....	43
Figure 3.2	Risk management process (adapted from HB205-2004 as in Lingard, Stranieri, & Blismas (2006)).....	51
Figure 3.3	Hierarchy of OHS risk controls (Source: AS/NZS (1997) as cited in RMIT (2009)).....	53
Figure 3.4	Time/safety influence curve (Szymberski, 1997).....	55
Figure 3.5	Factors affecting implementation of designing for safety (Source: Gambatese et al. (2005)).....	56
Figure 3.6	Example of Toulmin Argument Structure (TAS), adapted from TAS to represent construction	63
Figure 3.7	GAAM Family Law example (As cited in Muecke & Stranieri (2007)).....	64
Figure 3.8	The TAS that underlies knowledge representation in Split Up.....	65
Figure 3.9	Section of Split-Up Argument tree (Stranieri, Yearwood, & Zeleznikow, 2002).....	66
Figure 3.10	The inference procedure of ToolSHED (Cooke et al., 2008).....	67
Figure 4.1	IBS Thrust in the CIMP 2006-2015.....	72

Figure 4.2	IBS policy milestone for Malaysia (1999-2010) (Source: CIDB, 2010).....	73
Figure 4.3	Classification of IBS in MMC.....	76
Figure 4.4	Categorisation of IBS used for the study (Adapted from Gibb, 1999).....	81
Figure 4.5	Degree of Industrialisation (Richard, 2005).....	84
Figure 4.6	Industrialisation value creation (CIB Report, 2010).....	85
Figure 4.7	Typical Industrialised Building System (IBS) Construction Process (Adapted from Hamid, 2010).....	87
Figure 4.8	Conventional and IBS processes – Adapted from McKay (2010).....	88
Figure 4.9	Comparison between IBS and traditional construction (Source: MODTECH (2011)).....	89
Figure 4.10	Changes in risk profile of traditional versus pre-assembly (Source: Gibb, 2003).....	94
Figure 4.11	OSP model (Source: Haslam et al., 2003).....	97
Figure 5.1	Flow of the chapter.....	101
Figure 5.2	Research design.....	106
Figure 5.3	Steps in the research process.....	115
Figure 5.4	Example of construction process mapping for ‘insitu concrete and masonry’ method (partial)	123
Figure 5.5	Model development process.....	126
Figure 5.6	Example of argument tree showing the inference procedure.....	128
Figure 5.7	Framework of the model validation – Scenario testing.....	130
Figure 5.8	Example of the validation survey form – Case A.....	134
Figure 5.9	Example of the evaluation of the model for gravitational energy.....	138
Figure 6.1	The sequence of phases for the study.....	141
Figure 6.2	Three-storey semi-detached house	142
Figure 6.3	The project under construction.....	142
Figure 6.4	Another view of the project under construction.....	142
Figure 6.5	The activities involved in the construction of wall and frame. Associated risks/hazards are noted alongside the activities.....	144
Figure 6.6	Production yard for the integrated wall/column panels.....	149
Figure 6.7	Stacking of precast wall panels before delivery to site.....	149
Figure 6.8	The architectural features of the system.....	149
Figure 6.9	Construction site of the hostel.....	150
Figure 6.10	Installed column-wall panel.....	150

Figure 6.11 The activities involved when using a column-wall panel system.....	152
Figure 6.12 Production of precast column offsite.....	159
Figure 6.13 Building construction in progress.....	159
Figure 6.14 Four-storey hostel construction.....	159
Figure 6.15 The activities involved in the construction of the precast frame system.....	161
Figure 6.16 Variety types of blocks (Source: Manufacturer's website – withheld for anonymity).....	166
Figure 6.17 Production facility of the CMU blocks.....	166
Figure 6.18 Construction of the project using blockwork system.....	167
Figure 6.19 Another view of the blockwork system.....	167
Figure 6.20 The activities involved in the construction of walls using the dry Blockwork system.....	169
Figure 6.21 A view of the manufacturing facility.....	175
Figure 6.22 Slab ready to accept the panels (Source: Manufacturer's website – withheld for anonymity).....	175
Figure 6.23 Panel is being lifted into place by crane (Source: Manufacturer's website – withheld for anonymity).....	176
Figure 6.24 The activities involved in a construction of the lightweight wall panelized system.....	177
Figure 7.1 Steps in developing the argument tree model.....	185
Figure 7.2 Example of the argument tree structure.....	190
Figure 7.3 Child node and parent node in the argument tree.....	190
Figure 7.4 Assigning linguistic and numerical value.....	191
Figure 7.5 Inference procedure.....	192
Figure 7.6 Example of the inference procedure.....	193
Figure 7.7 Argument tree showing the inference procedure of the potential damaging energy for loading components or material onto a truck.....	195
Figure 7.8 Sample argument tree showing inferences.....	198
Figure 7.9 Example of the confirmation of design inclusion prior to assessing the tree.....	200
Figure 8.1 Model validation framework (reproduced for convenience).....	209
Figure 8.2 Example of the selection of design options to form scenario features.....	211
Figure 8.3 Analysis of the participants' demographic.....	217
Figure 8.4 Example of amended argument trees for lifting element.....	231

Figure 8.5 Example of amended argument trees for lifting element.....	233
Figure 8.6 Example of amended argument trees for concreting, vibrating and surface finishing.....	234
Figure 8.7 Example of amended argument trees for concreting, vibrating and surface finishing.....	236
Figure 8.8 Example of amended argument trees for scaffolding works.....	237
Figure 8.9 Comparison of participants' average score and the tool-generated scores for each case study scenario.....	239
Figure 9.1 Cross-case evaluation process.....	242
Figure 9.2 Risk profile - gravitational energy.....	249
Figure 9.3 Risk profile - kinetic energy.....	252
Figure 9.4 Risk profile - chemical energy.....	254
Figure 9.5 Risk profile - vibration energy.....	256
Figure 9.6 Risk profile - electrical energy.....	258
Figure 9.7 Risk profile - noise energy.....	260
Figure 9.8 Selection of design options to reduce the risk.....	262
Figure 9.9 Example of modifying the argument tree to a lower risk level.....	262
Figure 9.10 Example of the use of three variables used to form the argument tree.....	265
Figure 9.11 Example of the process assessment argument trees for assessing gravitational energy damage at the manufacturing stage.....	266
Figure 9.12 Example of multiple-risk view of column-wall panel system.....	269

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Percentage ratio of number of fatalities in construction industry to the total fatalities reported to DOSH for the year 2007, 2008 and 2009.....	13
Table 2.2	Costs associated with disabling injuries and fatalities in the US construction industry.....	16
Table 2.3	Types of accident and its description	21
Table 2.4	Description of damaging energies (Source: Safetyline Institute, 2005).....	36
Table 3.1	Some perspectives on safety indicators when measuring safety performance.....	43
Table 4.1	Classification of offsite system for different countries.....	77
Table 4.2	Level of industrialised production and definition (Source: Gibb, 1999).....	77
Table 5.1	Research approaches and designs (Adapted from Fellows & Liu (2008)).....	102
Table 5.2	Relevant situation for different research design or strategy (Source: Yin (2009)).....	103
Table 5.3	Research objective and research design.....	105
Table 5.4	Types of case studies (Source: Jensen & Rodgers (2001)).....	108
Table 5.5	Details of case studies.....	112
Table 5.6	Sources of Evidence: Strengths and Weaknesses (Source: Yin (2009)).....	117
Table 5.7	Information gathered during data collection.....	118
Table 5.8	Key individuals of interviews.....	121
Table 5.9	Example of the damaging energies for delivery works using an IBS column-wall panel system.....	124
Table 5.10	Some example of the references of secondary sources in delivery stage.....	125
Table 5.11	Panel of experts details.....	132
Table 5.12	Results of validation survey for Case A.....	136
Table 6.1	Damaging energies for delivery during the in situ concrete and masonry method.....	145
Table 6.2	Damaging energies for in-situ works using a conventional insitu concrete and masonry method.....	147

Table 6.3 Damaging energies for manufacturing works using IBS column-wall panel system.....	154
Table 6.4 Damaging energies for delivery works using the IBS column-wall panel system.....	156
Table 6.5 Damaging energies for component installation works using the IBS column-wall panel system.....	157
Table 6.6 Damaging energies for in-situ works using the IBS column-wall panel system.....	158
Table 6.7 Damaging energies for installation works using the precast frame system.....	163
Table 6.8 Damaging energies for in-situ works of the precast frame system.....	164
Table 6.9 Damaging energies for manufacturing of the dry blockwork system.....	171
Table 6.10 Damaging energies for delivery of the dry blockwork system.....	172
Table 6.11 Damaging energies for installation works using the dry blockwork system...	173
Table 6.12 Damaging energies for in-situ works using the dry blockwork system.....	174
Table 6.13 Damaging energies involved in manufacturing of panelized system.....	179
Table 6.14 Damaging energies for delivery of panelized system.....	181
Table 6.15 Damaging energies for on-site installation works using the lightweight panelised system.....	180
Table 7.1 Factors considered for developing argument trees for delivery of components to site.....	188
Table 7.2 Number of relevant factors within tree from which the damaging energies are inferred.....	199
Table 8.1 Description of cases in case study scenarios.....	210
Table 8.2 Different features in Case A scenarios.....	213
Table 8.3 Demographic profile of the participants.....	215
Table 8.4 Different features in Case B.....	219
Table 8.5 Different features in Case C.....	221
Table 8.6 Different features in Case D.....	222
Table 8.7 Different features in Case E.....	224
Table 8.8 Results from the tool-generated score and participants' mean score on each case study scenario.....	225
Table 8.9 Results from the tool-generated score, participants' mean score and inter-rater agreement (IRA) within participants' scores for each case study scenario.....	229

Table 9.1 Comparison of the case studies.....	243
---	-----



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BOWEC	Building Operation of Work Engineering and Construction
CIDB	Construction Industry Development Board
CIMP	Construction Industry Master Plan
DOSH	Department of Occupational Safety and Health
FMA	Factory and Machinery Act
IBS	Industrialised Building Systems
KBS	Knowledge-Based Systems
MMC	Modern Method of Construction
OHS	Occupational Heath and Safety
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Act
SOCISO	Social Security Organization
TAS	Toulmin's Argument Structure
ToolSHeD	Tool for Safety and Health in Design



PTTA UTHM
PERPUSTAKAAN TUNKU TUN AMINAH

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Malaysia's construction industry has been long described as a dangerous industry, in view of its poor health and safety performance. One initiative of the Malaysian government to address occupational health and safety (OHS) in construction is the widespread adoption of Industrialized Building Systems (IBS), commonly termed 'offsite' construction. An IBS approach is commonly deemed to be safer than conventional construction because it changes the nature of the construction process, and requires fewer workers onsite. This assumption is based on the risk concept of reduced exposure to hazards; however, no method yet exists for determining the relative safety of various construction methods, including IBS, compared to traditional in-situ methods. This study explores the impact of IBS on construction workers' safety and health by a thorough investigation of the activities and associated risks in IBS and traditional construction, with the aim of providing a comparative evaluation of the OHS risks involved in different construction approaches.

This introductory chapter presents the context of the research, including the aims and objectives. It outlines the research methodology, and describes the structure of the thesis.

1.2 Research context

1.2.1 Malaysia's construction industry accident rates

The Malaysian construction industry plays a significant role in the development and growth of the country's domestic economy, generating further demands for construction activities (Abdullah & Wern, 2011; Hamid, Majid, & Singh, 2008; Seyyed Shahab Hosseini, 2012). However, the industry has earned the reputation of being a highly hazardous industry due to its high rates of accidents and fatalities (Abdullah & Wern, 2011; Seyyed Shahab Hosseini, 2012). There is therefore an urgent need to improve health and safety performance of Malaysia's construction industry .

Accident statistics for the Malaysian construction industry, as reported in the Social Security Organization (SOCSO) Annual Report, are too high (Foo, 2005; SOCSO, 2000, 2009). The most recent figures produced by the Department of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH) reveal that twenty-two (22) out of sixty-six (66) fatality cases were attributed to the construction industry (DOSH, 2013). These reports, as explained in section 2.1, provide clear evidence that the industry is one of the critical sectors in need of a significant and rapid overhaul to its current site safety practices (Hamid et al., 2008). This thesis suggests that understanding the hazards within different construction processes, such as IBS, will provide critical new information that can help improve construction health and safety.

1.2.2 The relative safety of IBS

Of the many initiatives that could be implemented to improve OHS performance, offsite construction (commonly termed IBS in Malaysia) has been suggested as a replacement to traditional construction methods (CIDB, n.d., 2007). The Malaysian government is actively promoting the adoption of IBS and encouraging a paradigm shift in the construction process, from a traditional to an industrialized approach. This is demonstrated by the promulgation of the Construction Industry Master Plan (CIMP) 2006-2015 (CIDB, 2007), which specifically mentions IBS and its implementation through IBS Roadmaps.

The nature of activities in IBS differs from that of traditional processes. IBS is an industrialized process in which components of a building are conceived, planned, and fabricated, and then transported to and erected on site (Junid, 1986). Claims have been made that IBS, or more specifically offsite construction, can reduce site accidents (Gibb, 1999; Toole & Gambatese, 2008; Gangolells, Casals, Forcada, Roca, & Fuertes, 2010; McKay, 2010). However, the extent of this impact on safety and health in construction is still unclear, as there are no current systems to comparatively assess OHS risks in different construction processes. McKay (2012) has identified the OHS risks of both onsite and the offsite processes, but presents a static assessment that lists hazards of specific processes, rather than comparing the extent of the risks of the various processes. There is therefore a need for a robust dynamic method for comparing different construction processes, such as IBS and traditional approaches, to determine the relative safety and health performance of these

processes. Further, the context of the Malaysian construction industry needs to be superimposed on this methodology as current work is centred on developed industries such as the UK/Europe, US and Australia.

1.2.3 The concept of ‘designing for safety’ and IBS

The benefits of IBS can be better understood if viewed as a change from the traditional design of construction products and processes. This is because, moving from traditional construction methods to IBS changes the process, and the changing design decisions may affect the significance of a particular safety risk. Different construction processes possess different hazards and risks. Therefore, by integrating construction process knowledge into design process, hazards and risks during construction can be eliminated or reduced through process change. The decision to use a particular construction method happens at the design stage, when designers put forward the construction method that offers potential OHS risk reduction throughout the construction process. This is in line with the concept of ‘designing for safety’, where all safety aspects are considered during the design process, with the aim of reducing or eliminating hazards during construction (Behm, 2005). The ‘designing for safety’ concept is implicit in product design, therefore many studies relating to ‘designing for safety’ imply product design, rather than process design. This study focuses on process design, which provides options for designers on how to build the product, thus adding value to the current body of knowledge.

In Malaysia, initiatives for addressing safety in the design phase are defined in the Master Plan for Occupational Safety and Health in Construction Industry 2005-2010 (CIDB, n.d.) and Occupational Safety & Health Master Plan for Malaysia 2015 (Ministry of Human Resources, n.d.). Some of the positive recommended actions addressing OHS are related to ‘designing for construction safety’ and include education in OHS concepts, and providing guidelines for clients to have safety and health design checks put in place before construction (CIDB, n.d.; Ministry of Human Resources, n.d.). However, it is doubtful that Malaysian construction designers adequately understand how to identify, assess and control OHS risks in their designs. This assumption is based on the ‘nature of the job/responsibility’, in which designers are usually not involved in or responsible for OHS. Therefore, it is vital to have a

structure that can assist Malaysian construction designers to better integrate OHS risk management into the design process.

In order to evaluate and compare the OHS risks throughout traditional and IBS construction processes, a structured method incorporating specialist OHS knowledge and guidance is required. An 'argumentation theory model' (Toulmin, 1958; as cited in Yearwood & Stranieri, 2006) building on the work of Cooke, Lingard, Blismas, & Stranieri (2008) is proposed as a method to integrate the management of occupational health and safety risk into the design process. Cooke et al.'s work was developed from structured knowledge in the context of uncertainty and discretionary decision making, involving expert reasoning regarding design impacts on OHS risk represented by 'argument trees' (Cooke et al., 2008). Their model explored the use of argumentation theory in product design, which focused on the implementation of physical aspects of the design. This thesis presents the development of a process-centric model that consists of a series of argument trees for best practice reasoning that can be used by designers or decision makers when examining the OHS risks posed in different construction processes. The argument trees consist of knowledge which were developed by focusing on the process involved to build a product in various construction processes. The model provides consideration of product and process design concurrently, thus contributing to the body of knowledge. In addition to Cooke et al.'s model, an 'energy damage model' (Viner, 1991) is used as an underpinning framework for developing the present model. The development of this model suggests options for the decisions that can be made by product and process designers, in such a way as to assess the extent to which their design decisions mitigate the OHS risk in construction, and thereby offering a more rigorous relative comparison of OHS risks between IBS and traditional approaches.

1.3 Research purposes

This section outlines the research question and objectives, with a description of the scope and limitations of the research.

REFERENCES

- Abdelhamid, T., & Everett, J. (2000). Identifying root causes of construction accidents. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 126(1), 52–60.
- Abdul Kadir, M. R., Lee, W. P., Jaafar, M. S., Sapuan, S. M., & Ali, A. A. A. (2006). Construction performance comparison between conventional and industrialised building systems in Malaysia. *Structural Survey*, 24(5), 412–424.
- Abdullah, D. N. M. A., & Wern, G. C. M. (2011). An Analysis of Accidents Statistics in Malaysian Construction Sector. In *2010 International Conference on E-business, Management and Economics IPEDR* (Vol. 3). Hong Kong: IACSIT Press.
- Abdullah, M. N. K. (2003). *Kajian Amalan Kerja Perancah di Tapak Bina*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Skudai.
- Abdullah, M. R., & Egbu, C. (2009). IBS in Malaysia: Issues for research in a changing financial and property market. In *BuHu 9th International Postgraduate Research Conference (IPGRC)* (pp. 15–25).
- Adler, M., & Ziglio, E. (1996). *Gazing Into the Oracle: The Delphi Method and Its Application to Social Policy and Public Health*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Alaghbari, W. A. (2005). *Factors affecting construction speed of industrialized building systems in Malaysia*. University Putra Malaysia.
- Andres, R. N. (2002). Risk assessment and reduction: a look at the impact of ANSI B11.TR3. *Professional Safety*, 20–26.
- Antoniadis, D., & Thorpe, A. (2003). Evaluation of risks using 3D Risk Matrix. In F. Bontempi (Ed.), *2nd International Conference on Structural and Construction Engineering, System-Based Vision for Strategic and Creative Design* (pp. 2179–2184). Rome, Italy.
- Arbous, A. G., & Kerrich, J. E. (1951). Accident Statistics and the Concept of Accident Proneness. Part I: A Critical Evaluation. Part II: The Mathematical Background. *Biometrics*, 4, 341–433.
- Arkerkar, R. A., & Sajja, P. S. (2010). *Knowledge-Based Systems*. USA: Jones and Barlett Publishers.
- AS/NZS. (1997). AS/NZS 4804: Occupational Health and Safety Management Systems – General Guidelines on Principles, Systems and Supporting Techniques.

- Atkinson, A. R., & Westall, R. (2010). The relationship between integrated design and construction and safety on construction projects. *Construction Management & Economics*, 28(9), 1007–1017.
- Attewell, P., & Rule, J. B. (1991). Survey and Other Methodologies Applied to IT Impact Research: Experiences From a Comparative Study of Business Computing. In K. L. Kraemer (Ed.), *In The Information Systems Research Challenge: Survey Research Methods - Volume 3* (pp. 299–315). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Azman, M. N. A., Ahamad, M. S. S., Majid, T. A., & Hanafi, M. H. (2010). Perspective of Malaysian Industrialized Building System on the Modern Method of Construction. In *The 11th Asia Pacific Industrial Engineering and Management Systems Conference The 14th Asia Pacific Regional Meeting of International Foundation for Production Research*. Melaka, Malaysia.
- Badir, Y. F., Kadir, M. R. A., & Hashim, A. H. (2002). Industrialized Building Systems Construction in Malaysia. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 8, 19–23.
- Bakri, A., Mohamad Zin, R., Lee, C. K., Misnan, M. S., & Tahir, M. (2009). Quantitative assessment model for safety and health in IBS Constructio. In *International Conference on Quality, Productivity and performance measurement (ICQPPM'09)*. Putrajaya.
- Bakri, A., Zin, R. M., Misnan, M. S., & Hakim, A. (2006). Occupational safety and health (OSH) management systems: Towards development of safety and health culture. In *Proceedings of the 6th Asia-Pacific Structural Engineering and Construction Conference (APSEC 2006)*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Ballard, G., & Arbulu, R. (2004). Making prefabrication lean. In *12th International Group for Lean Construction Conference*. Elsinore, Denmark.
- Behm, A. (2004). *Establishing the link between construction fatalities and disabling injuries and the design for construction safety concept*. Oregon State University.
- Behm, M. (2005). Linking construction fatalities to the design for construction safety concept. *Safety Science*, 43, 589–611.
- Behm, M. (2006). *An Analysis of Construction Accidents from a Design Perspective*. Silver Spring, MD: The Center to Protect Workers' Rights.
- Bench-Capon, T. (1998). Specification and implementation of Toulmin dialogue game. In J. Hage, T. Bench-Capon, A. Koers, C. de V. Mestdagh, & C. Grutter (Eds.), *Jurix 1998 Foundation for Legal Knowledge Based Systems*. Gerard Noodt Institut.
- Berg, H.-P. (2010). Risk Management: Procedures, Methods and Experiences. *RT&A*, 1.
- Bing, L., Kwong, Y. W., & Hao, K. J. (2001). *Seismic behaviour of connection between precast concrete beams*. *CSE Research Bulletin*.

- Bird, F. E., & Germain, G. L. (1990). *Practical loss control leadership*. Loganville GA: International Loss Control Institute.
- Blismas, N. G., Gibb, A. G. F., & Pasquire, C. L. (2006). Benefit evaluation for off-site production in construction. *Construction Management and Economics*, 24(2), 121–130.
- Blismas, N., & Wakefield, R. (2007). Drivers, constraints and the future of off-site manufacture in Australia. *Construction Innovation Special Edition 2008*.
- Boehm, B. . (1989). *Software Risk Management. Tutorial*. Washington: IEEE Computer Society.
- Boyd, N., Khalfan, M., & Maqsood, T. (2013). Off-Site Construction of Apartment Buildings. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 19(1), 51–57.
- Brauer, R. L. (1994). Risk management and assessment. In *Safety and Health for Engineers* (pp. 543–572). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- BURA. (2005). *Steering and development forum report: MMC evolution or revolution*. London, United Kingdom.
- Carter, G., & Smith, S. (2006). Safety hazard identification on construction projects. *Journal of construction engineering and Maangement*, 132(2), 197–205.
- Cavaye, A. L. M. (1996). Case study research: A multi-faceted research approach for IS. *Information Systems Journal*, 6, 227–242.
- Central Bank of Malaysia. (2008). *Monthly Statistical Bulletin, January 2008*.
- Cham, W. S. (2011). *Quantitative approach to site accident in Malaysia*. Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman.
- Cheng, E. W. L., Li, H., Fang, D. P., & Xie, F. (2004). Construction safety management: An explarotary study from China. *Construction Innovation: Information, Process, Management*, 4(4), 229–241.
- Choi, T. N. Y., Chan, D. W. M., & Chan, A. P. C. (2011). Perceived benefits of applying Pay for Safety Scheme (PFSS) in construction – A factor analysis approach. *Safety Science*, 49(6), 813–823. doi:10.1016/j.ssci.2010.10.004
- Choudhry, R., Fang, D., & Mohamed, S. (2007). The nature of safety culture: A survey of the state-of-the-art. *Safety Science*, 45, 993–1012.
- Wingate, C. M. (2012). Work and Health Statistics in Australia. Retrieved February 02, 2015, from <http://lawisanass-wingate.blogspot.com/2012/02/work-and-health-statistics-in-australia.html>

- Chung, L. P. (2006). *Implementation strategy for Industrialized Building System (IBS)*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysiag, Johor Bharu, Malaysia.
- CIB Report. (2010). *New perspective in industrialization in construction – a state – of – the art report*, CIB Publication 329.
- CIDB. (1998). *Report on Colloquium on Industrialised Construction System*. Kuala Lumpur.
- CIDB. (2003). *Survey on the Usage of Industrialised Building Systems (IBS) in Malaysian Construction Industry*. Kuala Lumpur.
- CIDB. (2005). *IBS Survey 2005: Survey on Malaysian Architects*. Kuala Lumpur.
- CIDB. (2006a). Construction Industry Standard (CIS) 10:2008 Safety and Health Assessment System in Construction. Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board (CIDB).
- CIDB. (2007a). *Malaysian Construction Outlook 2007*. Kuala Lumpur.
- CIDB. (2007b). Construction Industry Master Plan (CIMP 2006-2015). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board.
- CIDB. (2010a). IBS Info, Issue 3/2010, IBS Centre Publication. IBS Centre Publication. Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board Malaysia (CIDB).
- CIDB. (2010b). No Title. Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board (CIDB).
- CIDB. (2011a). IBS Roadmap 2011-2015. Kuala Lumpur.
- CIDB. (2011b). IBS Info. Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board (CIDB).
- CIDB. (n.d.). Master Plan for Occupational Safety and Health in the Construction Industry 2005-2010. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board (CIDB). Retrieved from <https://www.cidb.gov.my/cidbv4/images/pdf/OHSAS2006v2.pdf>
- CIRIA. (1999). *Adding value to construction projects through standardisation and pre-assembly in construction*, Report R176. Gibb, AGF Groak, S Neale, RH Sparksman, WG. London.
- Cole Report. (2003). *Reform of occupational health and safety: Volume 6, Final report of the Royal Commission into the building and construction industry*. Australia.
- Connaway, L. S., & Powell, R. . (2010). Basic research methods for librarians (5th edition.). California: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Cooke, R. M. (1997). Uncertainty modelling: examples and issues. *Safety Science*, 26(1-2), 49–60.

- Cooke, T., Lingard, H., & Blismas, N. (2007). On-line OH&S risk assessment for construction designers: The "TOOLSHEd" prototype. In D. Boyd (Ed.), *Procs 23rd Annual ARCOM Conference* (pp. 441–450). Belfast, UK: Association of Researchers in Construction Management.
- Cooke, T., Lingard, H., Blismas, N., & Stranieri, A. (2008). ToolSHeD TM The development and evaluation of a decision support tool for health and safety in construction design ToolSHeD e. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15(4), 336–351. doi:10.1108/09699980810886847
- Court, P. F., Pasquire, C. L., Gibb, G. F., & Bower, D. (2009). Modular Assembly with Postponement to Improve Health, Safety, and Productivity in Construction. *Practice Periodical on Structural Design and Construction*, 14, 81. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)1084-0680(2009)14:2(81)
- Cox, S., & Cox, T. (1996). *Safety, systems and people*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- CRC Construction Innovation. (2007). *Off-site manufacture in Australia : Current state and future directions*. (Nick Blismas, Ed.). Queensland, Australia: Icon.Net Pty Ltd.
- CSI. (2005). The Project Resource Manual – CSI Manual of Practice. (T. C. S. Institute, Ed.) (Fifth Edit.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Darke, P., Shanks, G., & Broadbent, M. (1998). Successfully completing case study research: combining rigor, relevance and pragmatism. *Information Systems Journal*, 8, 273–289.
- Davies, V. J., & Tomasin, K. (1996). *Construction Safety Handbook*. Thomas Telford.
- Davison, J. (2003). *The development of a knowledge based system to deliver health and safety information to designers in the construction industry*. London.
- Dharmapalan, V. (2011). Risk factor quantification of design elements for multistory commercial office buildings. Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.
- Dharmapalan, Vineeth, & Gambatese, J. A. (2012). Comparison of Design Risk Factors of Multistory Commercial Office Buildings. *Construction Research Congress 2012*, 299–309.
- Din, H. (1984). Industrialised Building and Its Application in Malaysia. In *Seminar on Prefabrication of Building Construction*. Kuala Lumpur.
- DOSH. (2008). *Guidelines for Hazard Identification, Risk Assessment and Risk Control (HIRARC)*. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Occupational Safety and Health.
- DOSH. (2013). *Accident statistic*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

- DOSH. (2014). Accident Statistics. Department of Occupational Safety and Health, Ministry of Human Resources. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Department of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH). Retrieved January 26, 2015, from http://www.dosh.gov.my/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=498&Itemid=260&lang=en
- Edwards, L. (1995). *Practical Risk Management in the Construction Industry*. London: Thomas Telford Publications.
- Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Building Theory from Case Study Research. *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532–550.
- Esa, H., & Nuruddin, M. M. (1998). *Policy on industrialized building system*. Kuala Lumpur.
- ETWB. (2000). *Chapter 12 – Pay for Safety Scheme*. Hong Kong: Environment, Transport and Works Bureau, Hong Kong SAR Government.
- European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. (1991). From drawing board to building site (EF/88/17/FR). Dublin.
- Everett, J. G., & Slocum, A. H. (1994). Automation and Robotics Opportunities: Construction versus Manufacturing. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 120(2), 443–452.
- Farley, A., & Freeman, K. (1995). Burden of proof in legal argumentation. In *Proceedings of Fifth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law* (pp. 156–164).
- Fawcett, H., & Wood, S. (1982). *Safety and accident Prevention in Chemical Operations* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fellows, R. F., & Liu, A. M. M. (2008). *Research Methods for Construction* (Third.). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Fellows, R., & Liu, A. (1997). *Research methods for Construction*. Blackwell Science Limited.
- Feyer, A.-M., Williamson, A. M., Stout, N., Driscoll, T., Usher, H., & Langley, J. D. (2001). Comparison of work related fatal injuries in the United States, Australia, and New Zealand: method and overall findings. *Injury prevention : journal of the International Society for Child and Adolescent Injury Prevention*, 7(1), 22–8. Retrieved from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1730691&tool=pmcentrez&rendertype=abstract>
- Fong, C. O. (2004). *Minister Of Human Resources (2004) Speech in Majlis Penyampaian Faedah*.
- Foo, C. L. (2005). Budgeting For Occupational Safety And Health Management And Its Implementation. In *MBAM Annual Safety Conference*.

- Freeman, K. (1994). *Toward formalizing dialectical argumentation*. University of Oregon.
- Friend, M. A., & Kohn, J. P. (2010). *Fundamentals of Occupational Safety and Health* (Fifth.). Lanham, Maryland: Government Institutes.
- Fung, I. W. H., Tam, V. W. Y., Lo, T. Y., & Lu, L. L. H. (2010). Developing a risk assessment model for construction safety. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28(6), 593–600.
- Furst, P. G. (2010). Construction injury prevention through design. Retrieved November 20, 2011, from [http://www.designforconstructionsafety.org/Documents/construction Injury Preventon through Design.doc](http://www.designforconstructionsafety.org/Documents/construction%20Injury%20Prevention%20through%20Design.doc)
- Gambatese, J A, Behm, M., & Hinze, J. W. (2005). Viability of designing for construction worker safety. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management ASCE*, 131, 1029–1036.
- Gambatese, J. (1996). *Addressing construction worker safety in the project design*. University of Washington.
- Gambatese, J. A. (2000). Owner involvement in construction site safety. In *Proceedings Of Construction Congress VI*. Orlando, Florida.
- Gambatese, J. A., Behm, M., & Rajendran, S. (2008). Design's role in construction accident causality and prevention: perspectives from an expert panel. *Safety Science*, 46(4), 675–691.
- Gambatese, J. A., Hinze, J., & Hass, C. (1997). Tool to design for construction worker safety. *Journal of Architectural Engineering*, 3(1), 32–41.
- Gangoellis, M., Casals, M., Forcada, N., Roca, X., & Fuertes, A. (2010). Mitigating construction safety risks using prevention through design. *Journal of Safety Research*, 41, 107–122.
- Gann, D. M. (1996). Construction as a manufacturing process? Similarities and differences between industrialized housing and car production in Japan. *Construction Management and Economics*, 14, 437–450.
- Gibb, A. (2004). Designing for Safety and Health in Construction – A European/UK View. In *Designing for Safety and Health in Construction: Proceedings from a Research and Practice Symposium* (pp. 44–57). Portland: C.I.B. Working Commission W99 and the European Construction Institute.
- Gibb, A. G. F., Pavitt, C., & McKay, L. Designing for health and safety in cladding installation - implications from pre-assembly. , Proceedings of International Conference on Building Envelope Systems and Technologies (ICBEST) (2004). Sydney, Australia.

- Gibb, A. G. F., & Isack, F. (2003). Re-engineering through pre-assembly: client expectations and drivers. *Building Research & Information*, 31(2), 146–160.
- Gibb, A., Haslam, R., Hide, S., & Gyi, D. (2004). The role of design in accident causality. In S. Hecker, J. Gambatese, & M. Weinstein (Eds.), *Designing for Safety and Health in Construction: Proc., Research and Practice Symposium*. Eugene, OR: UO Press.
- Gibb, A.G.F. (1999). *Off-site Fabrication: Prefabrication, Pre-assembly and Modularisation*. Caithness: Whittles.
- Gibb, A.G.F. (2001). Standardization and pre-assembly - distinguishing myth from reality using case study research. *Construction Management and Economics*, 19(3), 307–315.
- Gibb, A.G.F. (2003). Dry sites – impacts of off-site production and automation on accidents and occupational health risks. Edinburgh, Scotland.: Association of Planning Supervisors CPD events, October-December, APS.
- Gibb, A.G.F., Pavitt, C., & McKay, L. Designing for health and safety in cladding installation - implications from pre-assembly. , Proceedings of International Conference on Building Envelope Systems and Technologies (ICBEST) (2004). Sydney, Australia.
- Gibb, Alistair G.F. (1999). *Off-site Fabrication: Prefabrication, Pre-assembly and Modularisation*. UK: Whittles Publishing Services.
- Gibb, Alistair, Haslam, R., Gyi, D., Hide, S., & Duff, R. (2006). What causes accidents? *Proceedings of the ICE - Civil Engineering*, 159(6), 46–50. doi:10.1680/cien.2006.159.6.46
- Gillen, M., Baltz, D., Gassel, M., Kirsch, L., & Vaccaro, D. (2002). Perceived safety climate, job demands, and coworker support among union and non-union injured construction workers. *Journal of Safety Research*, 33, 35–51.
- Gillham, B. (2000). *Case study research methods*. London: Continuum.
- Glasow, P. A. (2005). *Fundamentals of survey research methodology*. McLean, Virginia: Mitre.
- Glendon, A. I., & McKenna, E. F. (1995). *Human Safety and Risk Management*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- Goodier, C., Gibb, A. G. F., Ashley, D., & Taylor, M. (2005). *Buildoffsite Glossary of Terms*, Version 1.2. London: Buildoffsite.
- Haddon, W. (1973). Energy damage and the ten countermeasure strategies. *Journal of Trauma*, 13, 321–331.

- Hallowell, M. R. (2008). *A formal model for construction safety and health risk management*. Oregon State University.
- Hallowell, M. R., & Gambatese, J. A. (2009). Activity-Based Safety Risk Quantification for Concrete Formwork Construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, (October), 990–999.
- Hamid, A. R. A., Majid, M. Z. A., & Singh, B. (2008a). An overview of construction accidents in Malaysia. In M. I. Mohamad (Ed.), *Issues in Construction Industry* (pp. 110–123). Johor Bahru, Malaysia: Penerbit Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.
- Hamid, A. R. A., Majid, M. Z. A., & Singh, B. (2008b). Causes of accident at construction sites. Abdul. *Malaysian Journal of Civil Engineering*, 20(2), 242–259.
- Hamid, A. R. A., Yusuf, W. Z. W., & Singh, B. (2003). Hazards at construction sites. In *Proceedings of the 5th Asia-Pacific Structural Engineering and Construction Conference (APSEC 2003)* (pp. 26–28). Johor Bahru, Malaysia.
- Hamid, Z., Kamar, K. A. . M., Zain, M., Ghani, K., & Rahim, A. H. A. (2008). Industrialized Building System (IBS) in Malaysia: The Current State and R&D Initiatives. *Malaysia Construction Research Journal (MCRJ)*, 2(1), 1–13.
- Hampson, K., & Brandon, P. (2004). *Construction 2020: A vision for Australia's property and construction industry*. Brisbane, Australia: Cooperative Research Centre for Construction Innovation for Icon.Net Pty Ltd.
- Haron, N. A., Hassim, S., Kadir, M. R. A., & Jaafar, M. S. (2005). Building cost comparison between conventional and formwork system: a case study on four-story school buildings in Malaysia. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2(4), 819–823.
- Haslam, R. A., Hide, S. A., Gibb, A. G. F., Gyi, D. E., Atkinson, S., Pavitt, T. C., ... Suraji, A. (2003). *Causal factors in construction accidents: Final Report to HSE, UK, 3955/R33.068*. UK.
- Hassim, S., Jaafar, M. S., & Sazalli, S. A. A. H. (2009). The contractor perception towers Industrialised building system risk in construction projects in Malaysia. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 6, 937–942.
- Heinrich, H. W. (1959). *Industrial Accident Prevention* (4th ed.). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.
- Heinrich, H. W., Petersen, D., & Roos, N. (1980). *Industrial accident prevention: a safety management approach* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hinze, J. (1997). *Construction safety*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Hinze, J., Devenport, J., & Giang, G. (2006). Analysis of Construction Worker Injuries That Do Not Result in Lost Time. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 132(3), 321–326.

- Hinze, J. W. (1996). The distractions theory of accident causation, in Implementation of Safety and Health on Construction Sites. In R. J. Alves Dias L. M. and Coble (Ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference CIB Working Commission* (pp. 375–384). Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Hinze, J., & Wiegand, F. (1992). Role of Designers in Construction Worker Safety. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 118(4), 677–684.
- Hislop, R. D. (1999). *Construction site safety: A guide for Managing Contractors*. Florida: Lewis Publishers.
- Holmes, N., Lingard, H., Yesilyurt, Z., & Munk, F. De. (1999). An Exploratory Study of Meanings of Risk Control for Long Term and Acute Effect Occupational Health and Safety Risks in Small Business Construction Firms. *Journal of Safety Research*, 30(4), 25–261.
- Howarth, T., & Watson, P. (2009). *Construction Safety Management*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- HSE. (2009). *Construction Intelligence report: Analysis of Construction Injury and Ill Health Intelligence*. London.
- Hussey, J., & Hussey, R. (1997). *Business research*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Idrus, A., Hui, F. K., & Utomo, C. (2008). Perception of Industrialized Building System (IBS) Within the Malaysian Market. *ICCBT 2008*, 75–92.
- Ismail, E. (2001). Industrialised building system for housing in Malaysia. In *6th Asia Pacific Science and Technology Manageemnt Seminar*. Tokyo.
- Jafri, H., Ali, M. W., Ahmad, A., & Kamsah, M. Z. (2005). Effective occupational health and safety performance measurements. In *ICCBPE/SOMCh* (pp. 702–708).
- Jankowicz, A. D. (2000). *Business research projects*. London: Business Press.
- Jaselskis, E., Anderson, S., & Russell, J. (1996). Strategies for Achieving Excellence in Construction Safety Performance. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 122(1), 61–70.
- Jeffrey, J., & Douglas, I. (1994). Safety Performance of the United Kingdom Construction Industry. In Gainesville (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Rinker International Conference Focusing on Construction Safety and Loss Control* (pp. 233–253). University of Florida.
- Jensen, J. L., & Rodgers, R. (2001). Cumulating the intellectual gold of case study research. *Public Administration Review*, 61(2), 236–246.
- Jin, R., & Chen, Q. (2013). Safety Culture- Effects of Environment, Behavior & Person. *Professional Safety*, (May), 60–70.

- Johnson, P., Zuolkernan, I., & Tukey, D. (1993). Types of expertise: an invariant of problem solving. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 39, 641.
- Jung, Y., Kang, S., Kim, Y. S., & Park, C. (2008). Assessment of safety performance informatin systems for general contractors. *Safety Science*, 46(4), 26–29.
- Junid, S. M. S. (1986). Industrialised Building Systems. In *Proceedings of a UNESCO/FEISEAP Regional workshop*. Serdang.
- Kadir, M. R. A., Lee, W. P., Jaafar, M. S., & Sapuan, S. M. (2006). Construction performance comparison between conventional and industrialised building systems in Malaysia. *Structural Survey*, 24(5).
- Kamar, K. A. M. (2010). *The critical success factors and readiness of contractors in adopting Industrialised Building System (IBS) construction*. University of Salford.
- Kamar, K. A. M., Alshawi, M., Hamid, Z. A., Nawi, M. N., Haron, A. T., Abdullah, M. R. (2009). Industrialised Building Systems (IBS): A review of experiences in UK and Malaysian construction. In *2nd Construction Industry Research Achievement International Conference (CIRAIC)* (pp. 1–12). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Kamar, Kamarul Anuar Mohd, Hamid, Z. A., Azman, M. N. A., & Ahamad, M. S. S. (2011). Industrialized Building System (IBS): Revisiting Issues of Definition and Classification. *International Journal of Emerg. Sci.*, 1(2), 120–132.
- Kangari, R. (1988). Construction Risk Management. *Civil Engineering System*, 114–120.
- Kartam, N. A., Flood, I., & Koushki, P. (2000). Construction Safety in Kuwait: procedures, problem, and recommendation. *Journal of Safety Science*, 36, 163–184.
- Kavanagh, T. C., Muller, F., & O'Brien, J. J. (1978). *Construction Management – A Professional Approach*. New York: McGraw- Hill Book Company.
- Kelly, B. (1951). *The prefabrication of houses*. New York: The Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and John Wiley.
- King, R. W., & Hudson, R. (1985). *Construction Hazard and Safety Handbook*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Klein, K. J., Conn, A. B., Smith, D. B., & Sorra, J. S. (2001). Is everyone in agreement? An exploration of within-group agreement in employee perceptions of the work environment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 3–16.
- Korman, R. (2001). Wanted: New Ideas. Panel Ponders Ways to end Accidents and Health Hazards. *Engineering News-Record*, 26–29.
- Koskela, L. (1992). *Application of the New Production Philosophy to Construction. Technical Report #72*.

- Kulchartchai, O., & Hadikusumo, B. H. W. (2010). Exploratory Study of Obstacles in Safety Culture Development in the Construction Industry: A Grounded Theory Approach. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 15(1), 45–66.
- Labour Department. (2009). Occupational Safety and Health Statistics Bulletin. *Occupational Safety and Health Branch, Labour Department*.
- Lai, D. N. C., Liu, M., & Ling, F. Y. Y. (2011). A comparative study on adopting human resource practices for safety management on construction projects in the United States and Singapore. *International Journal of Project Management*, 29(8), 1018–1032. doi:10.1016/j.ijproman.2010.11.004
- Langford, D., Rowlinson, S., & Sawacha, E. (2000). Safety behaviour and safety management: its influence on the attitudes of workers in the UK construction industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 72(2), 133–140.
- Larios, J. A., Sanz, M. A., Pellicer, E., & Catala, J. (2012). Construction health and safety from a lean production approach. In *XVI Congreso Internacional de Ingeniería de Proyectos* (pp. 11–13). Valencia.
- Leedy, P., & Ormrod, J. . (2001). *Practical research: planning and design* (7th editio.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Lenat, D. B. (1983). The role of heuristics in learning by discovery. In *Machine Learning: An Artificial Intelligence Approach*. Palo alto.
- Lessing, J., Stehn, L., & Ekholm, A. (2005). Industrialised housing: Definition and categorization of the concept. In *Proceedings IGLC-13, July 2005* (pp. 471–480). Sydney, Australia.
- LFS. (2012). Labour Force Survey 2012.
- Lin, J., & Mills, A. (2001). Measuring the occupational health and safety performance of construction companies in Australia. *Facilities*, 19(3/4), 131–138.
- Ling, F. Y. Y., Liu, M., & Woo, Y. C. (2009). Construction fatalities in Singapore. *International Journal of Project Management*, 27(7), 717–726.
- Lingard, H. C., Cooke, T., & Blismas, N. (2010). Safety climate in conditions of construction subcontracting: a multi-level analysis. *Construction Management and Economics*, 28(8), 813–825. doi:10.1080/01446190903480035
- Lingard, H., & Holmes, N. (2001). Understandings of occupational health and safety risk control in small business construction firms: barriers to implementing technological controls. *Construction Management and Economics*, 19(2), 217–226.
- Lingard, H., & Rowlinson, S. (2005). *Occupational Health and Safety in Construction Project Management*. Abingdon, Oxon: Spon Press.

- Lingard, H., Stranieri, A., & Blismas, N. (2006). Supporting the design OHS process: a knowledge-based system for risk management. In K. Brown, K. Hampson, & P. Brandon (Eds.), *Clients Driving Innovation: Moving Ideas Into Practice, Co-operative Centre for Construction Innovation* (pp. 225–234). Brisbane, Australia: Icon.Net Pty Ltd.
- Lingard, Helen, Cooke, T., & Blismas, N. (2012). Do Perceptions of Supervisors ' Safety Responses Mediate the Relationship between Perceptions of the Organizational Safety Climate and Incident Rates in the Construction Supply Chain ? *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, (February), 234–241. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000372.
- Low, S. P., & Sua, C. S. (2000). The maintenance of construction safety: riding on ISO 9000 quality management systems. *Journal of quality in Maintenance Engineering*, 6(1), 28–44.
- Lubega, H. A., Kiggundu, B. M., & Tindiwensi, D. (2000). An Investigation into the Causes of Accidents in the Construction Industry in Uganda. In *2nd International Conference On Construction In Developing Countries: Challenges Facing The Construction Industry In Developing Countries* (pp. 1–12).
- Maccormick, N. (1995). Argumentation and interpretation in law. *Argumentation*, 9(3), 467–480.
- Mansor, S. A. (2010). The 7th Malaysia Construction Sector Review and Outlook Seminar. Kuala Lumpur. Retrieved August 31, 2010, from http://www.kkr.gov.my/files/PRESS CIDB 3 Ogos_0.pdf
- Manu, P., Ankrah, N., Proverbs, D., & Suresh, S. (2010a). Exploring the causal influence of construction project features in accident causation. In P. Barrett, D. Amaratunga, R. Haigh, K. Keraminiyage, & C. Pathirage (Eds.), *Proceedings of CIB 2010 Congress*. Salford, UK.
- Manuele, F. A. (1997). *On the practice of safety*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Matthews, J. (1993). *Health and Safety at Work* (2nd ed.). Sydney: Pluto Pres.
- McIntyre, L. J. (1999). *The practical skeptic: Core concepts in sociology*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.
- Mckay, L. J. (2010). *The Effect Of Offsite Construction On Occupational Health and Safety*. Loughborough University.
- McKay, L J, Gibb, A. G. F., Haslam, R., & Pendlebury, M. (2002). Implications for the effect of standardization and pre-assembly on health, safety and accident causality - preliminary results. In D. Greenwood (Ed.), 18th Annual ARCOM Conference. University of Northumbria: Association of Researchers in Construction Management.

- McKay, L. J., Gibb, A. G. F., Haslam, R., & Pendlebury, M. (2003). The development of an accident causal model for off-site production construction. In D. J. Greenwood (Ed.), *19th Annual ARCOM Conference* (Vol. 1, pp. 213–222). University of Brighton.
- McKay, L. J. (2010). *The Effect Of Offsite Construction On Occupational Health and Safety*. Loughborough University.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ministry of Human Resources. (n.d.). *Occupational Safety and Health Master Plan for Malaysia 2015*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Human Resources.
- Ministry of Manpower (MOM). (2007). *Information and statistics*. Singapore.
- Misnan, M. S. (2013). Safety management: Implementation, review and audit SHASSIC assessment tools for safety. *Universiti Teknologi Malaysia*. Retrieved October 01, 2013, from http://ocw.utm.my/file.php/196/SBC3363-OCW_10_SHASSIC_Compatibility_Mode_.pdf
- Mitropoulos, P., Abdelhamid, T. S., & Howell, G. a. (2005). Systems Model of Construction Accident Causation. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 131(7), 816–825. doi:10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9364(2005)131:7(816)
- MODTECH. (2011). About Off-Site Construction. *Modtech Holdings, Inc.* Retrieved November 01, 2011, from <http://www.modtech.com/about-off-site-construction.php>
- Mohamed, S. (2003). Scorecard approach to benchmarking organizational safety culture in construction. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 129(1), 80–88.
- Monk, V. (1998). Postural assessment of building industry tasks using the Ovako Working Posture Analysing System. *Journal of Occupational Health and Safety Australia and New Zealand*, 14, 149–155.
- Muecke, N., & Stranieri, A. (2007). An argument structure abstraction for bayesian belief networks : just outcomes in on-line dispute resolution. In *Fourth Asia-Pacific Conference on Conceptual Modelling (APCCM 2007)* (pp. 35–40). Darlinghurst: Australian Computer Society, Inc.
- Myers, M. (1997). Interpretive Research in Information Systems. In J. Mingers & F. Stowell (Eds.), *Information Systems: An Emerging Discipline?* (pp. 239–266). London: McGraw-Hill.
- Nahmens, I., & Ikuma, L. H. (2009). An Empirical Examination of the Relationship between Lean Construction and Safety in the Industrialized Housing Industry. *Lean Construction Journal*, 1, 1–12.

- Nasly, M. A., & Yassin, A. A. M. (2009). Sustainable Housing Using an Innovative Interlocking Block Building System. In Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference on Civil Engineering (AWAM '09): Towards Sustainable Development. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Ng, K., Lamlund, A., Howell, G., & Lancos, G. (2012). Lean safety: Using leading indicators of safety incidents to improve construction safety. In I. D. Tommelein & C. L. Pasquire (Eds.), *Proceedings for the 20th Annual Conference of the International Group for Lean Construction: are We Near a Tipping Point?* San Diego, CA, USA: Montezuma Publishing. Retrieved from http://www.iglc20.sdsu.edu/papers/wp-content/uploads/2012/07/110_P_173.pdf
- Ngowi, A. B. (1996). Culture and safety at work site - A case study of Botswana, in Implementation of Safety and Health on Construction Sites. In R. J. Alves Dias L. M. and Coble (Ed.), *Proceedings of the First International Conference CIB Working Commission* (pp. 417–427). Honolulu, Hawaii.
- Noor, K. B. M. (2008). Case Study : A Strategic Research Methodology Khairul Baharein Mohd Noor. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(11), 1602–1604.
- NSC. (2003). *No Title*.
- NSC. (2006). *No Title*.
- O'Connor, T., Loomis, D., Runyan, C., Abboud dal Santo, J., & Schulman, M. (2005). Adequacy of health and safety training among young Latino construction workers. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 47(3), 272–277.
- Pan, W. (2006). *A decision support tool for optimizing the use of off-site technologies in housebuilding*. Loughborough University.
- Pan, W., Gibb, A. G. F., & Dainty, A. R. J. (2008). Leading UK housebuilders' utilization of offsite construction methods. *Building Research and Information*, 36, 56–67.
- Parid, W. (1997). Global trends in research. In *Development and Construction Proceeding of the International Conference on Industrialized Building System (IBS 2003)*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: Construction Industry Development Board (CIDB).
- PATH. (2002). *Technology Roadmap: Whole House and Building Process Redesign, One year Progress Report*. Washington, D.C, USA.
- Peng, C. S. (1986). The scenario of industrialised building systems in Malaysia. In *Proceedings of a UNESCO/FEISEAP Regional workshop*. UPM Serdang.
- Petersen, D. (1971). *Techniques of safety management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Petersen, D. (1980). *Analyzing Safety Performance*. New York, USA: Garland STPM Press.

- Peyton, R., & Rubio, T. (1991). *Construction Safety Practices and Principles*. USA: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Pipitsupaphol, T., & Watanabe, T. (2000). Identification of Root Causes of Labor Accidents in the Thai Construction Industry. In *Proceedings of the 4th Asia Pacific Structural Engineering and Construction Conference (APSEC 2000)* (pp. 193–202). Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Poon, S. W., Tang, S. L., & Wong, F. K. W. (2008). *Management and economics of construction safety in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Pousette, A., Larsson, S., & Törner, M. (2008). Safety climate cross-validation, strength and prediction of safety behaviour. *Safety Science*, 46, 398–404.
- Pryor, P., Stone, C., & Else, D. (2009). *Occupational Health and Safety Practitioner : Learning Guide Unit BSBOHS404B - Contribute to the Implementation of Strategies to Control Risk*. Western Australia: WorkSafe.
- Rahman, A. B. A., & Omar, W. (2006). Issues and challenged in the implementation of Industrialised Building Systems (IBS) in Malaysia. In *Proceedings of the 6th Asia-Pacific Structural Engineering and Construction Conference (APSEC 2006)*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Rajendran, S. (2006). *Sustainable Construction Safety and Health Rating System*. Oregon State University.
- Reason, J. (1990). *Human Error*. New York: Cabridge University Press.
- REDA/HKCA. (2005). Contractual provisions for safety scheme. The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong and The Hong Kong Construction Association. Retrieved from <http://www.safetypartnering.com/smd/pdf/pfss.pdf>
- Ren, H. (1994). Risk Lifecycle and Risk Relationships on Construction Projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 12(2), 68–74.
- Richard, R. . (2005). Industrialised Building System : Reproduction before automation and robotics. Canada. *Journal of Automation in Constuction*.
- Ridley, J., & Channing, J. (2003). *Safety at Work*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinmann.
- RMIT. (2009). *Guide to Best Practice for Safety Construction: Design Stage*. Melbourne: RMIT University.
- Runyan, C. W., & Baker, S. P. (2009). Preventing injuries by undertanding energy damage. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*. doi:10.2471/BLT.09.063586
- Safe Work Australia. (2002). National OHS strategy 2002–2012. Australia: Commonwealth of Australia.

- Safetyline Institute. (2005). *Occupational Health and Safety Practitioner: Hazard, Energy and Damage*. Western Australia: WorkSafe.
- SafeWork Australia. (2011). *Notified Fatalities Statistical Report 2009-2010*.
- Saifullah, N. M., & Ismail, F. (2012). Integration of Occupational Safety and Health during Pre-construction Stage in Malaysia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 35(December 2011), 603–610. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.02.127
- Salant, P., & Dillman, D. A. (1994). *How to conduct your own survey*. New York: John Wiley Co.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2000). *Research methods for business students*. Cape Town: Pearson Education.
- Seyyed Shahab Hosseinian, Z. J. T. (2012). Major theories of construction accident causation models: A literature review. *International Journal of Advances in Engineering & Technology*, 4(2), 53–66.
- Shafii, H., Musa, S. M. S., & Ghazali, N. M. (2009). *Masalah buruh asing dalam industri pembinaan dari perspektif kontraktor: Kajian kes di Johor Bharu, Johor Malaysia*. *Labour Review*, 3(1), 163–191.
- Siu, O., Phillips, D. R., & Leung, T. (2004). Safety climate and safety performance among construction workers in Hong Kong: the role of psychological strains as mediators. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 36(359-366).
- Shaari, S., & Ismail, E. (2003). Promoting the usage of Industrialized Building System (IBS) and Modular Coordination (MC) in Malaysia. *Construction Industry in Engineers* (Board of Engineer Malaysia).
- Smallwood, J. J. (1996). The influence of designers on occupational safety and health. In *Proceedings of the First International Conference of CIB Working Commission W99, Implementation of Safety and Health on Construction Sites* (pp. 203–213). Lisbon, Portugal.
- Smith, G. R., & Arnold, T. M. (1996). Safety performance measurement for masonry construction. In L. M. Alves Dias & R. J. Coble (Eds.), *Implementation of Safety and Health on Construction Sites, Proceedings of the First International Conference CIB Working Commission* (pp. 103–114). Rotterdam, Holland: Balkema.
- SOCISO. (2000). *Annual report for 2000*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- SOCISO. (2009). *Annual report for 2009*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Standard Australia/Standards New Zealand. (2009). AS / NZS ISO 31000 : 2009 Risk Management. NSW/Wellington.

- Standards Australia. (2004). *HB205-2004 OHS Risk Management Handbook*. Sydney.
- Stranieri, A., & Zeleznikow, J. (2001). WebShell: the development of web based expert system shells. In *SGES British Expert Systems Conference (ES'01)* (pp. 69–76).
- Stranieri, A., Zeleznikow, J., Gawler, M., & Lewis, B. (1999). A hybrid rule–neural approach for the automation of legal reasoning in the discretionary domain of family law in Australia. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 7(2-3), 153–183.
- Stranieri, A., Yearwood, J., & Zeleznikow, J. (2002). Argumentation structure that intergrate dialectical and non-dialectical reasoning. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 16(4), 331–348.
- Stranieri, A., & Zeleznikow, J. (2005). Knowledge Discovery from Legal Databases. In *Law and Philosophy Series*. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stranieri, Andrew, & Zeleznikow, J. (1999a). Evaluating legal expert systems. In *Proceedings of Seventh International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law* (pp. 18–24). ACM, Oslo.
- Stranieri, Andrew, & Zeleznikow, J. (1999b). A survey of argumentation structures for intelligent decision support. In *Information Systems and Decision Support Systems ISDSS'99*. Melbourne: Monash University Press.
- Stranieri, Andrew, Zeleznikow, J., & Yearwood, J. (2002). Argumentation structures that integrate dialectical and non-dialectical reasoning. *The Knowledge Engineering Review*, 16(04), 331–348. doi:10.1017/S0269888901000248
- Stranks, J. W. (1990). *A manager's guide to health and safety at work*. London: Kogan Page.
- Suraji, A., Duff, A. R., & Peckitt, S. J. (2001). Development of Causal Model of Construction Accident Causation. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 127(4), 337–345.
- Szymberski, R. (1997). Construction Project Safety Planning. *TAPPI Journal*, 80(11), 69–74.
- Tam, C. M., Zeng, S. X., & Deng, Z. M. (2004). Identifying elements of poor construction safety management in China. *Safety Science*, 42, 569–586.
- Tatum, C. B., Vanegas, J. A., & Williams, J. M. (1986). *Constructability improvement using prefabrication, pre-assembly and modularisation*, Technical Report No. 297. California.
- The Association for Project Safety. (2007). *Design Risk Management, Advice for Designers on the implications of the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007*. (N. S. Charlton, Ed.). London: RIBA Publishing.

- The Institution of Engineering and Technology. (2012). *The Costs to Industry of Accidents and Ill-Health*. Stevenage.
- Toakley, A. R. (1989). *Risk, uncertainty and subjectivity in the building procurement process - a critical review*. School of Building, University of New South Wales.
- Tobin, P. K. J. (2006). *The use of stories and storytelling as knowledge sharing practices: a case study in the South African mining industry*. University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- Toole, T Michael, & Gambatese, J. (2008). The trajectories of Prevention through Design in construction. *Journal of safety research*, 39(2), 225–30.
doi:10.1016/j.jsr.2008.02.026
- Toole, T. M. (2002). Construction Site Safety Roles. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 12(3), 203–201.
- Toole, T. M. (2005). Designing for safety: opportunities and barriers. *Journal of Professional Issues in Engineering Education and Practice*, 131(6), 199–207.
- Toole, T. M., Hervol, N., & Hallowell, M. (2006). Designing for construction safety. *Modern Steel Construction*, 46(6), 55–59.
- Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge (Vol. 70, p. 262).
- Trajkovski, S., & Loosemore, M. (2006). Safety implications of low-english proficiency among migrant construction site operatives. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, 446–452.
- Trethewy, R. W., Atkinson, M., & Falls, B. (2003). Improved hazard identification for contractors in the construction industry. *Journal of Construction Research*, 4(1), 71–85.
- Trikha, D. N. (1999). Industrialized Building System - Prospects in Malaysia. In *Proceedings of World Engineering Congress 1999: Industrialised Building Systems and Structural Engineering*. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia: UPM Serdang.
- Trikha, D. N., & Ali, A. A. A. (2004). *Industrialised Building System*. (Fist, Ed.). Kuala Lumpur: Universiti Putra Malaysia Press.
- Tutt, D., Dainty, A., Gibb, A., & Pink, S. (2011). *Migrant Construction Workers and Health & Safety Communication*. Norfolk: CITB-ConstructionSkills.
- Viner, D. (1991). *Accident Analysis and Risk Control*. New Delhi, India: Viner Pty Ltd.
- Viner, D. (1996). *Accident analysis and risk control*. Melbourne: Derek Viner Pty Ltd.
- Viner, D. (1998). *Energy, Injury and Risk*. (P. Pryor, Ed.). Melbourne: Training Materials.

- Warszawski, A. (1999). *Industrialized and Automated Building Systems*. London: E & FN Spon.
- Weaver, D. A. (2006). Symptoms of Operational Error. *Professional Safety*, 51, 48–54.
- White, R. B. (1965). *Prefabrication: a history of its development in Great Britain, National Building Studies Special Report 36*. London.
- Whittington, C., Livingston, A., & Lucas, D. A. (1992). *Research into management, organisational and human factors in the construction industry. Health and Safety Executive Contract Research Report 45/1992*. HMSO, London.
- Wickstrom, G., Hanninen, K., Lehtinen, M., & Riihimaki, H. (1978). Previous back syndromes and present back syndromes in concrete reinforcement workers. *Scandinavian journal of Work, Environment and Health*, 4 (Supplem, 20–29.
- Wilson, J., & Koehn, E. (2000). Safety management, problems encountered and recommended solutions. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 126(1), 77–79.
- Wong, F. K. W., Chan, A. P. C., Yam, M. C. H., Wong, E. Y. S., Tse, K. T. C., Yip, K. K. C., & Cheung, E. (2009). Findings from a research study of construction safety in Hong Kong: Accidents related to fall of person from height. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 7(2), 130–142. doi:10.1108/17260530910974952
- WorkCover. (2001a). *Safety meter: Performance Measurement Tool*. New South Wales, Australia.
- WorkCover. (2001b). *CHAIR - Safety in Design Tool*. New South Wales, Australia: WorkCover.
- Yates, W. D. (2011). *Safety Professional's Reference and Study Guide*. Boca Raton, Florida: Taylor & Francis Group, LLC.
- Yearwood, J. L., & Stranieri, A. (2006). The generic/actual argument model of practical reasoning. *Decision Support Systems*, 41(2), 358–379. doi:10.1016/j.dss.2004.07.004
- Yearwood, J., Stranieri, A., & Anjaria, C. (1999). The use of argumentation to assist in the generation of legal documents. In *DCS'99 Fourth Australasian Document Computing Symposium*. NSW, Australia: Southern Cross University Press.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed.). London: International Educational and Professional Publisher.
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (4th Editio.). Los Angeles, California: Sage Publications Inc.

- Zaini, O. (2000). Malaysian Construction Industry. Challenges and demand. In *Malaysian Structural Steel Association Convention*. Kuala Lumpur.
- Zelevnikow, J., & Stranieri, A. (1995). The Split Up system: integrating neural networks and rule based reasoning in the legal domain. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law (ICAIL '95)* (pp. 185–194).
- Zhou, Q., Fang, D. P., & Wang, X. (2008). A method to identify strategies for the improvement of human safety behavior by considering safety climate and personal experience. *Safety Science*, 46(1406-1419).
- Zhou, W. (2011). Knowledge-Based Collaborative Design Decision Framework for Construction Safety. In *eg-ice workshop 2011*. Enschede, the Netherlands. Retrieved from <http://ctwbisql1.ctw.utwente.nl/~hartmann/Proceedings/Papers in pdf/41.pdf>
- Zhou, W., Whyte, J., & Sacks, R. (2011). Building Safely by Design : Interim Report Building Safely by Design : Interim Report. UK.
- Zhou, W., Whyte, J., & Sacks, R. (2012). Construction Safety and Digital Design : A Review. *Automation in Construction*, 22, 102–111.
- Zohar, D. (1980). Safety Climate in Industrial Organizations : Theoretical and Applied Implications, 65(1), 96–102.
- Zou, P., & Zhang, G. (2009). Comparative Study on the Perception of Construction Safety Risks in China and Australia. *Construction Engineering Management*, 135(7), 620–627.